DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 136 784 IR 004 573

AUTHOR Herlig, Richard K.
TITLE National Dissemination Conference. Proceedings. (9th, Kansas City, Missouri, June 22-24, 1976)
INSTITUTION Council of Chief State School Officers, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Jun 76
NOTE 76p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Conference Reports; *Information Dissemination; *National Programs; *Projects; Summative Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS *National Dissemination Project

ABSTRACT

The objectives of this conference included (1) bringing conferees in contact with leaders of recent national dissemination endeavors, (2) allowing them to interact in voicing dissemination problems and posing possible solutions, and (3) eliciting concerns related to dissemination/diffusion efforts. The proceedings include lists of the participants, the program, and excerpts from reports on a number of conference highlights: National Dissemination Leadership Project, Dissemination Leadership Steering Committee, Council of Chief State School Officers Dissemination Resolution, NIE School Practice & Service, Interstate Project on Dissemination, Dissemination Analysis Group, and National Diffusion Network. Also included is an evaluation of the conference in terms of its objectives. Appendices contain a list of NIE School Practice and Service Grants, possible recommendations of the Dissemination Analysis Group Questionnaire, the conference evaluation instrument, and topical conference priorities. (WBC)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED136784

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PROCEEDINGS

NATIONAL DISSEMINATION CONFERENCE

June 22-24, 1976

Kansas City, Missouri

Richard K. Herlig, Director
National Dissemination Leadership Project

Council of Chief State School Officers
Washington, D. C.

IR004 573

MAJOR MILESTONES IN DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONAL DISSEMINATION CAPABILITY

1965 The U.S. Office of Education (USOE) implemented the Educational Research Information Center (ERIC), soon renamed the Educational Resource Information Center, to acquire, process, and store easily retrievable educational information for practitioners.

1969 USOE called the first National Dissemination Conference in Alexandria, Virginia, which brought together representatives from state education agencies to examine dissemination efforts within SEA's and to explore ways to improve capabilities.

1970 USOE established the National Center for Education Communication (NCEC) to become the focus for expanded efforts in information dissemination.

NCEC funded the Texas Education Agency for the purpose of operating a project to strengthen state dissemination programs, by holding national conferences and providing other opportunities for opening lines of communication between and among SEA's and USOE.

NCEC also funded three pilot projects — Oregon, South Carolina, and Utah — for testing the feasibility of the extension agent model on dissemination.

The second National Dissemination Conference was held in Austin, Texas.

1971 The third National Dissemination Conference was held in Columbia, South Carolina.

South Carolina became the funding agent for the second phase of the National Dissemination Project. The conferences were continued and information efforts were increased with establishment of a dissemination newsletter.

A small number of additional states were funded to establish information services, some with limited extension agent capabilities.

The fourth National Dissemination Conference was held in St. Louis, Missouri.

1972 Congress established the National Institute of Education with dissemination among its special charges; NCEC activities and staff were transferred to NIE.

The fifth National Dissemination Conference was held in Columbia, South Carolina.

1973 The Council of Chief State School Officers became the funding agent for the National Dissemination Project.

The sixth National Dissemination Conference was held in Chevy Chase, Maryland.

1974 The seventh National Dissemination Conference was held in Washington, D. C. It had a dual emphasis: 1) opening lines of communication between and among state education agencies and NIE, and 2) continuing the strengthening of state competencies in dissemination.

1975 The eighth National Dissemination Conference was held in Washington, D. C.

NIE began a program to strengthen state dissemination capabilities through a series of capacity building and special project grants.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

The Context. 1
The Objectives 3
Presentors, Moderators, Facilitators 3
The Program 10
The Conference 12
Greetings 13
Conference Highlights 17
National Dissemination Leadership Project 17
CCSSO Dissemination Resolution 20
NIE R&D Utilization Program 23
Interstate Project on Dissemination 25
Dissemination Analysis Group 30
National Diffusion Network 32
Evaluation 34
The Conference Participants 41
Location and Facilities 43
The Next Conference 43
Appendix A - Conference Participants 46
Appendix B - NIE School Practive and Service Grants . . . 56
Appendix C - Possible Recommendations of the DAG 59
Appendix D - Evaluation Instrument 64
Appendix E - Topical Conference Priorities 70

THE NATIONAL DISSEMINATION CONFERENCE

The Context

These are the proceedings of the ninth National Dissemination Conference. This conference is one of the objectives of the National Dissemination Leadership Project funded by NIE and administered by the Council of Chief State School Officers.

Other objectives of the Leadership Project are:

-- To provide administrative support for the operation of the National Steering Committee, established to provide leadership and policy guidance for the National Dissemination Leadership Project and its component activities.

-- To provide for and support an annual review of DRG plans for future fiscal years by State Education Agency (SEA) representatives.

-- To organize, arrange, and provide staff support for a three day National Dissemination Conference.

-- To coordinate and carry out activities for a program of information exchange among SEA dissemination staff.

- To provide administrative support for five regional and three topical SEA meetings.

- To have National Conference participants assess and evaluate the utility of the National Dissemination Leadership Project.

The members of the Steering Committee of the Leadership Project are listed below:

Vonda Lynn Wood, Kentucky
Glenn White, Missouri
Royal Henline, Nebraska
Gregory Benson, New York
George Katagiri, Oregon
Richard Brickley, Pennsylvania
Charles Mojkowski, Rhode Island
Virginia Cutter, Texas
Charles Haughey, NIE
William Israel, CCSSO

The Objectives

The conference objectives, established by the National Dissemination Leadership Project Steering Committee were:

-- To bring conferees in contact with leaders of recent national dissemination endeavors.

-- To allow conferees to interact in voicing dissemination problems, and posing possible solutions.

-- To elicit from conferees concerns related to dissemination/diffusion efforts.

Presentors, Moderators, and Facilitators

(in order of appearance)

Dr. Glenn White -- is the director of the Research Unit for the Missouri SEA. Glenn has been a member of the NDLP Steering Committee since 1973 and is this year' National Dissemination Conference Chairman.

Dr. Merle Bolton -- is Commissioner of Education in Kansas. He "inherited" the Kansas dissemination project (Project Communicate) when he became commissioner last year. Under his leadership, Project Communicate and the Title III, 306 state facilitator project have merged into the Kansas Educational Dissemination System.

Dr. Byron W. Hansford -- is the Executive Secretary for the Council of Chief State School Officers. Under his leadership, the Council has taken an active role in dissemination, evidenced by the National Dissemination Leadership Project, the Study of Dissemination Policy, Procedures and Practices of nine SEA's, the Councils' standing Committee on Research/Development and Dissemination, and the Dissemination Resolution.

Senta Raizen -- is an associate director of NIE. She is head of the Dissemination Resources Group (DRG) which includes the School Practices and Service division (Larry Hutchins, chief), Information and Communications Systems division (Tom Clemens, chief), and the R/D System Support division (Ward Mason, chief).

Gregory Benson -- is director of the New York SEA's Educational Programs and Studies (EPSIS) division, which includes the New York Capacity Building Project. Greg is co-chairman of the NDLP, and he has been on the Steering Committee since 1970. This is Greg's 9th dissemination conference.

Dr. Charles Haughey -- is Chief of the Communications and Linkage branch in the Information and Communications Systems division of NIE. He was

with the National Center for Educational Communications (NCEC) before that effort was transferred to NIE. Charles was the director of the Research and Information Services for Education (RISE) project in Pennsylvania.

Dr. Marlin Brockette -- is Commissioner of Education in Texas. He was one of the seven chiefs to initiate the IPOD study. Dr. Brockette was a member of the CCSSO policy committee that took the lead in developing the statement on dissemination. This statement was approved by the full Council in November 1975.

Lynn Wood -- is director of dissemination of the Kentucky SEA. This job includes the Dissemination Capacity Building Project funded by NIE. Lynn has been active in dissemination and her efforts include the Interstate Project on Dissemination, and the NDLP Steering Committee.

Royal Henline -- is director of Curriculum Services for the Nebraska SEA. Royal has been a member of the National Dissemination Leadership Project Steering Committee since 1971.

George Katagiri -- is director of Instructional Technology for the Oregon SEA. George was director of the Pilot State dissemination project for Oregon initiated in 1970. He has served on the Interstate Project on Dissemination and has been a member of the NDLP Steering Committee since 1971.

Virginia Cutter -- is director of the Division of Dissemination and Publications for the Texas Education Agency. Virginia's dissemination activities include: organizing the 1970 and 1971 National Dissemination Conferences, a study of nine SEA dissemination efforts for CCSSO, a member of the Dissemination Analysis Group, member of the Steering Committee of the NDLP, etc., etc...

Dr. Charles Mojkowski -- is director of the Information Center for the Rhode Island SEA. Charles is co-chairman of the NDLP Steering Committee. His dissemination activities include the Interstate Project on Dissemination, the Dissemination Analysis Group, and others.

Dr. Jerry Fletcher -- is senior policy analyst for the education division of HEW. He is chairman of the Dissemination Analysis Group. Jerry

was senior research associate at North West Regional Educational Laboratory, before coming to OE.

Jean Narayanan -- is chief of the Dissemination staff, Bureau of School Systems, for the Office of Education. Her office has had responsibility for the Title III, 306 state facilitator projects and for the Title I, Project Information Packages (PIPS).

Richard Brickley -- is director of the Research and Information Services for Schools (RISE) project in Pennsylvania. Also, he is the state Title III, 306 facilitator. Dick has been on the NDLP Steering Committee since 1973 and has directed training and leadership conferences for NIE.

Carol Reisinger -- is dissemination manager for the Illinois SEA. This position also includes the State Capacity Building Project and the State Dissemination Network.

Phyllis Galt -- is supervisor of the resources center for the Montana SEA. This center is a very important segment of the State Dissemination Capacity Building Project and Phyllis is part of the management team.

Joan Orender -- is director of the NIE Special Purpose Project for the Nebraska SEA. Joan has been active in the planning and development of the State Dissemination Project.

Dr. Winston Cleland -- is the supervisor of Research Dissemination for the Delaware SEA. He also directs the state NIE Capacity Building Project and is the State Dissemination Coordinator.

Dr. Beverly Wheeler -- is director of Dissemination for the Arizona SEA. Beverly has provided leadership in the Research Coordination Unit and the Resources section of the educational agency.

George Neill -- is Chief of the Office of Program Dissemination for the California SEA. George has been the dissemination coordinator from California for a number of years and has provided leadership in their dissemination capacity building efforts.

Ralph Parish -- is director of the Kansas Title III, 306 state facilitator effort (Project LINK). Under his leadership Kansas has sponsored many training seminars in needs assessment, change agent techniques, and for many of the developer/demonstrator

projects included in the National Diffusion Network, Ralph, with his dissemination knowledges and skills will be incorporated into the Kansas Educational Dissemination System.

Jim Connett -- is a state facilitator for the Kansas Title III, 306 facilitator project (Project LINK). Jim has been active in dissemination with a Title III project in Wichita, Kansas. Jim was invited to this conference primarily for his group processing skills.

Dr. Richard Herlig -- is director of the National Dissemination Leadership Project for the Council of Chief State School Officers. Dick started the Kansas dissemination project (Project Communicate) in 1971. He edited and produced the Information Dissemination Report (IDR) in Kansas for the CCSSO, and has been a member of the NDLP Steering Committee since 1973.

Participants

A list of people participating in the conference can be found in Appendix A. Primarily, the conferees were drawn from the official dissemination coordinators appointed by each Chief State School Officer. However, other groups were

represented at this Ninth Dissemination Conference, such as National Diffusion Network, Regional Educational Laboratories, and other interested parties.

The Program

(Day 1)

Objective 1	To bring conferees in contact with leaders of recent national dissemination endeavors

Welcome and conference overview -	Glenn White
Greetings from the Host State -	Merle Bolton
Greetings from the Council of Chief State School Officers -	Byron Hansford
Greetings from the National Institute of Education -	Senta Raizen
National Dissemination Leadership Project - (NDLP)	Greg Benson Charles Haughey
CCSSO Disseminations Resolution, Ramifications for State Education Agencies -	Marlin Brockette
NIE School Practices and Services Program, review of funded projects -	Senta Raizen
NDLP Regional Caucus -	Steering Committee

(Day 2)

Objective 2 — To allow conferees to interact in voicing dissemination problems, and posing possible solutions

Dissemination Problems and possible Solutions

Resources - Carol Reisinger
Greg Benson

Linkage - Joan Orender
Winston Cleland

Management - Beverly Wheeler
George Neill

NIE Dissemination Programs and Future Funding - Charles Haughey

(Day 3)

Objective 3 — To elicit from conferees concerns related to dissemination/diffusion efforts

TASK -- To provide input to the Steering Committee for the programs of the Topical Conferences

Group in Triads, six's, and twenty fours -- form consensus and priorities

Facilitators -- Ralph Parish
Jim Connett
Linda McNeely
Dick Herlig

Wrap up session --

Conference Evaluation and vouchers

Note:

Official SEA dissemination coordinators elected Steering Committee members in three of the five NDLP regions and three at-large members.

The Conference

The first General Session opened Tuesday afternoon, June 22, with greetings and an overview by conference chairman, Glenn White. ". . . the content of this years conference is the result of talking to a lot of people about things that they felt were needed in the whole dissemination effort. We received input from people in meetings, by the telephone, by letter to get the ideas which culminated in what we have to present for you the next two days. The conference has three major objectives, (1) to bring conferees in contact with leaders of recent national dissemination endeavors, (2) to allow conferees to interact in voicing dissemination problems, and posing possible solutions, and (3) to elicit from conferees concerns related to dissemination/diffusion efforts. As you see, there are plans for conferee input -- to give you part of the action".

White read a letter of greetings from Dr. Arthur Mallory, Commissioner of Education in Missouri. Mallory stressed that the work at which the conferees are engaged is important and promises to be a significant force in our efforts to provide quality education for the youngsters of this nation.

White read a telegram from Dr. Harold Hodgkinson, Director of NIE. It stated:

"I'm sorry that I will not be able to be with you at the National Dissemination Conference. Dissemination is an essential element of the total NIE program. Be assured that we will continue our efforts to assist State Education Agencies in building their dissemination capacity. We look to this conference to continue to develop and encourage cooperative relationships among state education agencies in dissemination activities".

Greetings from the host state (Kansas) were brought by Commissioner Merle Bolton. He stated, ". . . We educators must be willing to take a look at what and why and how we have been doing things in the past. We can certainly build on some of our past accomplishments, and we have made a great many. However, at the same time, we must be willing to discard some outmoded practices and try something

new on for size. We must get beyond the idea that some of those practices we've been carrying on so long are sacred cows. I would say the national dissemination effort provides that opportunity. I'm firmly convinced that the state education agencies must become involved more directly, than some have in the past. It's through these efforts that opportunities will be provided for us to become acquainted and implement projects that certainly will not make it necessary for us to plow the same ground twice...".

Greetings from the Council of Chief State School Officers were brought by their Executive Secretary, Byron Hansford. In stressing the role of the state agency, he said,". . . I think, very simply stated, the role of the State Department of Education should be leadership, service, and supervision - in that order. Now what do I mean by that? Through leadership you try to create the desire to improve on the part of everyone within the system, through service you try to help those people who decided that they want to do a better job, and finally you have to supervise and see what are the results. Not how did they go about it, but what are the results and do they require a little more stimulation and a little more help. Well, you can see that this puts you people (SEA dissemination coordinators) in the

absolute key role because if there is one thing that is fundamental to the success of an operation of a State Department of Education, it is helping to disseminate and diffuse good educational practices within the school systems in the state. There's nothing else that you can do that will take the place of that. . .".

Greetings from the National Institute of Education were brought by Senta Raizen. Her remarks included the following:

". . . I think we're all to the point where we know that information about is not enough. We have to follow through and see that something happens in the classroom as a result of telling people about what we hope are improved practices. I think if we Feds have learned anything over the last few years, particularly from people like you, it's that we have to work at this job of improving education cooperatively. You are the people that have the responsibility in the State Departments of Education. All we can do is try to assist you in ways that you see relevant. . . Our budget for 1977 pretty much provides for continuation of the activities that we were able to continue or to initiate this year. Most of you know about the competition in Larry Hutchin's shop, having to do with the follow through, the implementation component of R&D. We have just let our seven major contracts, of two

and a half to three years duration in total, to try to see whether we can't get a closer coordination between the expertise and the operating school systems. . .".

CONFERENCE HIGHLIGHTS

Objective 1 - To bring conferees in contact with leaders of recent national dissemination endeavors.

National Dissemination Leadership Project

Dr. Charles Haughey - Chief of the Communications and Linkage Branch of NIE

"In this part of the program, I have the responsibility for establishing some perspective on the project that brings us together today - the Dissemination Leadership Project. This is in every sense a joint SEA-NIE activity - a state and federal endeavor to collaborate in coordinating educational dissemination activities. We take the protocol for our activities pretty heavily from the pattern that the Chief State School Officers has established. Their tradition is reflective in the fact that each state is asked to identify and send to project meetings an official representative of the chief state school officer who is empowered to speak for the state in dissemination matters...

Our expectations for this project are that it will provide a forum for exchange of views among state and federal parti-

cipants - identify critical issues in educational dissemination and provide for rational consideration of those issues - develop a variety of mechanisms to bring together state representatives with other people who are concerned about dissemination. Project activities are designed to permit states to express their concerns, to develop their understanding and to articulate programs that will be implemented at the state level, as an individual state initiative or at a federal level through some kinds of federal funding program.

We are concerned that this project provide, on a widespread basis, the kind of leadership that we are supporting in the state capacity building projects. Let me emphasize two critical aspects of this project: First, it is important to us that the planning for the project be based on extensive participation of the state representative, that we deal with this project as a collaborative process. Secondly, we see the focus of this project on the development of a nationwide dissemination capacity. The term, Nationwide, received a recognition in the IPOD deliberations when there was much discussion of whether we ought to talk about a federal system or a national system. The advantages and disadvantages

of those two options were considered and it was finally decided that we really need a nationwide system in which all potential actors had an opportunity to contribute and to benefit as much as possible..."

Gregory Benson - Director of New York SEA Educational Programs and Studies Information Services

"The Dissemination Leadership steering committee is really the mechanism through which many of the goals, activities or intended outcomes happen. The steering committee is probably more important this year than it has ever been. There are a number of reasons for this. There are more states involved this year through capacity building and a number of other funding programs. The level of dissemination activity has increased substantially, and there is a lot more interest as evidenced by the kind of people we are finding at these conferences. Secondly, the National Dissemination Leadership Project itself has an increased budget which allows for things like topical conferences. In the past, we've had one national conference and steering committee efforts pretty much focused on arranging that conference. With these increased monies we hope to hold additional topical conferences and other activities - there-

by make involvement of the steering committee more continuous throughout the year...Some of the things the Steering Committee is involved in include a planning committee to work with NIE regarding their intended program plans and future program plans. That committee of nine must contain three steering committee members. There is a provision for sub-committees which will be chaired by steering committee members. An example of one of those is the IPOD project. We have approached Wilson Riles, who chairs the Council of Chief State School Officer's Committee on Research, Development and Dissemination...to offer the steering committee as staff support to his committee. We are pursuing that..."

Council of Chief State School
Officers
Dissemination Resolution

Dr. Marlin Brockette - Texas Commissioner of Education

"...I'm not here today as an official spokesman for the Council of Chief State School Officers. I'm here only as one of the Chief State School Officers involved in the action taken by the Council last November. For it was at this time, as all of you know, that the Council defined its own position on dissemination in a brief, yet defini-

tive policy statement. Although the statement is printed in your program, I'd like to quote it for you.

> Dissemination is a major state education agency function. The Council urges each Chief State School Officer to promote a coordinated, integrated dissemination system within each agency. In support of State efforts, the Council urges federal education agencies to reduce the frequency with which federal regulations and guidelines fragment dissemination. The Council advocates collaborative action of state and federal agencies to establish a nationwide system for sharing educational knowledge.

Let's look at the ramifications of the dissemination policy statement in relationship to individual states. Again let me repeat - The Council cannot, and further more, I believe, does not wish to speak for the individual state acting alone. Therefore, impact of its policy statements is hard to judge. Some states are already committed to every facet of the policy statement - rather we have a Council policy statement because it reflects

these states' commitment. Other states are less dedicated to dissemination. The statement may or may not influence them. Its real impact might depend upon some of you. Yes, some of you. You're here obviously because your chief has some concern for dissemination. In addition you're also here because you have an assignment related to dissemination. Combine these two ingredients - your chief's concern and your assignment - with the policy statement and the statement might be useful in your state. What do I mean? Simply this - if I were you and I felt my state might need to have a more solid commitment to dissemination, I believe I'd take advantage of my report to my chief on this conference, to review with him or her the Council's policy statement. In other words, I invite you to point out to your chief how the conference began with a look at the Council's statement and its ramifications. You might go further and discuss with him or her what seeking to follow the statement might mean in your state. For example, if a state is committed to dissemination as a major function, I believe you'd find evidence of such commitment in both organization and budget. I believe there would be some kind of visibility for the dissemination function - an organizational unit, a staff title, that would recognize

that dissemination is as important as curriculum development to educational improvement . . ."

NIE School Practice and Service
funded programs

Senta Raizen - Director of the Dissemination Resource Group of the National Institute of Education

"...If you look at NIE's legislation, our dissemination mission is a very broad one. It's not just concerned with R&D that NIE generates, but with seeing that research, development and exemplary practice gets disseminated and utilized wherever it may originate, and whoever might need it. So, we are following four strategies to carry out NIE's mandate in dissemination:

First, we need to understand the Research, Development, and Dissemination system, especially the factors that shape present practices and the relationships between the production and the utilization of knowledge...

The second major strategy is to assure full and effective access to the knowledge resources available. ERIC is, of course, a piece of that.

Third, this is what you folks (SEA Dissemination Coordinators) are all about. We feel that we need to help build capacity in education systems and institutions to disseminate and use the knowledge which is being made available. Of course we need to understand the system a little better so that our programs can be more useful.

And then fourth, if we have knowledge resources, if we have capacity to use those resources, if we understand the interaction among the many components of the knowledge producing and knowledge using system, we need to link it all together. Strengthening the linkages between R&D and the practice communities will require a variety of dissemination activities involving states, local and intermediate education agencies, R&D organizations, teaching institutions and professional associations.

The R&D utilization program is one way of putting it all together. It really is an action research program. There is no way that NIE would ever have the money to fund the kinds of services that are being funded under those seven contracts for very many sites. What that program is about is to try to develop cooperatively some

models of linkage research, development, and exemplary practice with the operating system - different kinds of models that are appropriate to their own context. If we can learn in what way those models work, then we can tell the country about what it takes for successful dissemination efforts. The objective is to encourage more rational decision making, to have a greater number of available alternatives displayed for school people that are having to make choices, to get R&D expertise to help them, either through other school systems that may have developed their own exemplary practices or from R&D agencies. The help can be for the selection process, for implementation, for adaption, for evaluation, or for reexamination of whatever problems they face. In any case, the R&D expertise is there at the behest of the schools and responsive to their needs, not imposed on them." (Appendix B)

Interstate Project On Dissemination

Virginia Cutter - Director of Dissemination, Texas Education Agency

"...All of you will recall that there was a great deal of discussion about the dollars being spent on research and development and nothing happening in the classroom.

You heard such things in Congress. You've probably heard it in your own state legislature. There was a great deal of concern over knowledge utilization or over the lack of it and that was one of the pieces that led to this project. The second was concern over state/federal dissemination relationships. In the spring of 1974, a group of states came together in Washington, met with some NIE people and talked about some really deep felt kinds of concerns about what was happening between the states and the federal agencies....We had taken a look at the state of the art of dissemination in various ways over the years but we really needed to take a look and to do something about advancing the state of the art. So these kinds of concerns gave rise then to the project because NIE responded and in the fall of 1974, seven states came together to form the Interstate Project On Dissemination...We had difficulty early on in the project with the word dissemination itself. We found an absolute lack of consistency of definition. We found that earlier definitions of dissemination in reports and conference proceedings and speeches usually were pretty narrow in their meaning as they referred to an outward flow of information...later ones had a tendency to grow, to en-

compass the two-way flow, to begin to move in to those things that in many people's minds were in diffusion activities. They were concerned with the movement of practice of research from one place to another with installation of that practice or the results of that study. So this was one of the things about the definition - this change over time."

Lynn Wood - Director of Dissemination, Kentucky Education Agency

"When we got into this part of the objective we really felt like we had quite a task but we didn't expect it to be quite as much of a task as it turned out to be. We felt sure that some place there was a compilation of all federal education legislation. And then we began to look at it and we discovered that in our individual states we didn't have it, and then we discovered the federal government didn't have it either. So we went to Congressman Carl Perkins office and he had been in the process of compiling one for some time but it was in no way complete. So they hurried it up for us and about the third or fourth month of the project we were able to get a compilation of all federal education legislation which was obviously the place we had to begin if we were

really going to analyze what federal education regulations there were regarding dissemination...I think of the findings, probably the most important of them is the fact that there was no definition of dissemination in all of the program regulations...Our second finding was that there were 208 different requirements. When you get to looking at the kinds of things state agencies are responding to and begin to wonder why we're having difficulty developing coordinated comprehensive dissemination systems, I think then that you look at the fact that there are 208 different dissemination requirements and that 40 of those relate to state education agencies, more than for any other single group. You then begin to see the scope of our problem. Your also begin to see the scope of the national problem in that these 208 requirements were assigned to 54 different agencies and actors."

Dr. Charles Mojkowski - Director of Dissemination,
Rhode Island Education Agency

"Our conception of what dissemination is, the legal and regulatory complexities that were described by Lynn (Wood), the complex array of dissemination activities, and resources that we have in SEA's at one in the same time, make it necessary to establish a coordinated dissemination capacity

in an SEA and also make it difficult to achieve. For that reason the IPOD group selected as one of its major obstacles, the development of a planning framework, for dissemination which would be most appropriate for SEA personnel...In a sense, we then tried to develop a framework for planning in a state education agency. We did not propose to develop a model, that is a specific set of activities as to how a state would conduct dissemination. I believe that there may be as many as 57 different models on how states and territories may conduct dissemination. There may be a few less but there certainly isn't a model that SEA's can follow to implement a dissemination program...We identified basically four elements of a dissemination system in an SEA. We are not talking about these elements as being physical components that would exist in a SEA, therefore we are not talking about the bureau of information or a bureau of incentives or a division of linkages. We do not even prescribe that any agency categorize the variety of activities and resources it has, it needs some kind of a framework placing those things in cell, so to speak, and for looking more intensively and analytically at the variety of things going on. We identified three core components of an SEA dissemination system and those are information, incentives, and linkages. We also, of course identified a

management function, a management component and management element as a very critical part of a dissemination system..."

Dissemination Analysis Group

Dr. Jerry Fletcher - Senior Policy Agent for the Education Division of HEW

"The Assistant Secretary for Education of the Education Division of HEW established last summer a dissemination Policy Council. It is composed of two representatives from OE, two from NIE, and is chaired by the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Education of HEW. They are charged with reviewing the educational dissemination system, to assess the impact of Federal dissemination programs, policies, legislation and regulations and recommending changes for improving the system. I serve as the staff for the Dissemination Policy Council.

We have invited very widespread input. In fact, you are today going to have an opportunity to give us some more input. We have identified areas where changes are needed. We are developing a list of decision options. While we plan to send this list of recommendations and options out to a lot of people, we would like your reactions today.

We have come up with a four-level definition of dissemination that appears to organize the field well. The first level we have labelled "Spread". That's our code word. This is one-way communication. A lot of discussions about dissemination get into trouble because they don't want to acknowledge that a lot of dissemination is of that kind. A lot of dissemination is blanket mailings - you never know if the people who are supposed to get the stuff actually get the stuff or not...

The second level is something we have labelled "Exchange". That's our code word. By exchange we mean all the activities that take one-way dissemination and make it two-way, or multi-way (it can be more than two). Most of us that are engaged in trying to improve dissemination of information/communication of knowledge are, in fact, trying to get people who only use one-way and make it two-way, to set up some kind of needsensing mechanism so that you know whether the stuff that you're sending out is in a form that people can use, or some kind of feedback mechanism so that you can determine whether the people who received it really used it...

We needed to have a definition that incorporates the issue of use. The third and fourth levels do this. Our code word for the third level is "Choice". We're saying that if you're interested in dissemination and facilitating use, one step to that is to improve the choice process at the local district level, to make it, if you will, "more rational", to make it better in some way, more systematic, made from a base of more knowledge, and more information of a wider variety of things...The fourth level is all that stuff that happens after a local district makes a choice, and our code word for that is "Implementation", which we define as facilitating the adoption, the adaption, the installation and the sustaining of improvements...So, there are four parts: our code words are Spread, Exchange, Choice and Implementation... (Appendix C)

National Diffusion Network

Jean Narayanan - Chief of the dissemination staff,
Bureau of School Systems for the OE

"In a way, the National Diffusion Network got started <u>not</u> as a conscious attempt to set up a nation-wide dissemination system but in response to a very practical problem: how does one use $13 million available in State allotments

for one year to have the greatest potential impact on improving educational opportunities. A select group of ESEA, Title III constitutents, convened to advise OE, recommended the focus on the diffusion of proven educational practices.

The Network as it was developed consists of the interaction of two types of actors - Developer/Demonstrators and State Facilitators (SF). The former, or DD's as they've come to be known, are the developers of the exemplary program and provide materials, training, and technical assistance to other school district staff. State Facilitators, operating out of local school districts - the Title III legislation restrict eligible applicants to LEA's - with the advice and consent of the SEA's, perform various functions.

All SF's create awareness of all projects approved as effective by the Education Division's Joint Dissemination Review Panel (JDRP) among all school districts in their State or region within a State. All promote rational choice among proven educational alternatives and help bring the LEA with a need together with an LEA with a solution. A given Facilitator's strategies reflect both the needs of

the area served and the talents of the SF staff. Some play a major role in developing LEA needs assessment, consensus building, and organizational development skills. The NDN seems to hold promise for moving exemplary programs quickly from the development site to several other school sites at a fraction of the development cost - an average additional $5,000 Federal expenditure seems to enable a district to access an initial $300,000 investment. The challenge which lies ahead is to move the Network activities into agencies which have broader responsibilities than those normally assigned to LEA's while preserving the benefits which seem to have stemmed from "peer-to-peer relationships."

The Evaluation

The evaluation instrument was designed to obtain information about the value of the objectives on the conference as well as how well the objectives were met. Conferees were asked, "Was the objective a worthwhile endeavor for a national conference?" Their response was tallied in three catagories, [ ] very much so, [ ] it was O.K., [ ] no!

The evaluation instrument also included questions regarding the location and facilities, as the last several conferences had been held in the Washington, D. C. area. The instrument also requested information about the conferee as to employer, professional time spent on dissemination/diffusion activities, and age range. The form used is in Appendix D.

Objective 1 - To bring conferees in contact with leaders of recent national dissemination endeavors:

Objective 1 seemed to be accomplished, as practically all conferees rated the objective high, and were able to have informal interaction with the program leaders. The real evaluation, however, is the utilization of the conference presentations to the real world of developing a dissemination program. In this perceived utilization, the Interstate Project on Dissemination ranked the highest, with the National Diffusion Network a close second. The CCSSO resolution plus ramifications and the Dissemination Analysis Group findings ranked lowest.

It is interesting to note that the presentation rankings and the utilization rankings were positively correlated. When asked if the objective was a worthwhile endeavor for a national conference, thirty-five conferees stated very much so, eleven stated that the objective was O.K., and only one said no. The page of the evaluation form for objective 1 with tally accumulated from all instruments follows.

Objective 2 - To allow conferees to interact in voicing dissemination problems, and posing possible solutions:

The National Dissemination Leadership Project Steering Committee in planning this part of the conference desired something different than the typical small group presentation. It was decided to have new project people (non-experts) pose questions to an

NATIONAL DISSEMINATION CONFERENCE
EVALUATION

OBJECTIVE 1 — To bring conferees in contact with leaders of recent national dissemination endeavors

Did the conference accomplish that objective? 38 yes, 0 no, 6 sort of --

Were you able to have any informal sessions with the leaders of the programs?

31 yes 4 no, did not desire too. 8 no, not enough time.

Please indicate your reaction to and/or possible results of the objective with each activity.

	The Presentation					Probable utilization of information		
	poor		O.K.		very good	subject not relevant to our program	informative would like to use back home	great!! most likely will use back home
Council of Chief State School Officers [CCSSO] dissemination resolution	7	7	18	10	5	9	22	5
Interstate Project on Dissemination	1	0	4	11	30	0	17	20
Dissemination Analysis Group	8	3	14	12	8	7	24	4
National Diffusion Network	1	1	16	15	12	3	20	10
NIE School Practices and Services Funded Programs	3	11	18	11	1	6	20	4

Was the objective a worthwhile endeavor for a national conference?

35 very much so, 11 it was O.K., 1 no!

audience of experienced and inexperienced conferees. Hopefully, the "non-experts' would ask questions that the inexperienced conferees would not ask and the experienced conferees would pose possible solutions. The non-experts were carefully chosen (see page 11) to pose sincere queries into dissemination practices.

Conferees could choose two of the three sessions. Each session was one hour in length and each was repeated once.

Of the conferees that filled out the evaluation instrument, 24 stated that they attended one of the resources sessions, 21 stated that they attended one of the linkage sessions, and 31 stated that they attended one of the management sessions.

When asked about their experience in the field of dissemination, sixteen conferees considered themselves experienced, sixteen considered themselves relatively new to the field, and eleven considered themselves somewhere in-between.

The evaluation instrument instructed conferees to mark appropriate statements listed below:
(The tallys are cumulative from all instruments)

19 I gained much from the questions asked.

18 I knew the questions to ask - but not the answers.

25 The solutions proposed seemed realistic.

31 The "non-experts" really seemed sincere in seeking solutions.

3 The questions asked had no relationship to what I am doing or plan to do.

1 It was a wasted afternoon.

4 I would rather sit and listen to an "expert".

The evaluation instrument also asked if the objective was a worthwhile endeavor for a national conference. Twenty-one stated that it was O.K., fifteen stated very much so, and three said no.

A somewhat different room arrangement was utilized for the three groups in this exercise, as the groups were in different corners of the very large ballroom. Large signs stating, "MANAGEMENT", "LINKAGE", and "RESOURCES" were posted so conferees could easily ascertain the category and location. Potential group members could check the agenda for the "non-experts", check the signs for the location, and check the convening group for attendance.

The evaluation instrument attempted to collect data pertaining to this room utilization. The results are below:

"Having different activities simultaneously in the very large meeting room was designed to produce a feeling of much activity."

24 I liked that room utilization.

11 I prefer the smaller break-out rooms.

12 There was too much activity; I was distracted.

Objective 3 - To elicit from conferees concerns related to dissemination/diffusion

Task 1 of this objective was to provide input through the Committee of Nine for the annual review of NIE dissemination plans. Task 2 of the same objective was to provide input to the NDLP Steering Committee for the programs of the (three) Topical

conferences provided for in the NDLP contract.

In the conference staff meeting and debriefing session on the previous evening it was determined that it was rather ambitious to try to accomplish Task 1 and Task 2 of Objective 3, and close the conference by noon. As the conference was scheduled to close by 12:30 and conferees had planes to meet it seemed impossible to extend the conference to meet both Task 1 and 2.

It was determined that Task 1 could be better met at a later date. The Committee of Nine could elicit input from SEA Dissemination Representatives by mail after they had reviewed the FY '78 plan in relationship to the President's budget for NIE.

The decision was made to have conferees work on Task 2 with the group processing techniques originally scheduled for Task 1, i.e. group in triads, then six's, then twelves, to form consensus and priorities. The large conference room was set up with small tables with three chairs each. The conferees were instructed to take the role of "talker", "listener", or "observer" in the interaction in each triad. The observer would also clarify or paraphrase statements of the talker. In succeeding two minute intervals the roles were switched as to allow each of the members of the triad to take each role.

The triads were then instructed to pair up with another triad to form groups of six's. These groups were given a sheet of newsprint and a marker and instructed to list six

concerns that might be considered at one of the NDLP Topical conferences. As each group member was forced to express concerns individually in the triads, the listing task of the larger group was not inhibited - rather the requirement limiting the group to only six concerns forced the group to form consensus.

The groups of six's were then merged into twelves and the task was to clarify the list from the smaller groups and to re-word any duplicate issues. There were four groups of twelve that ended up with about nine concerns on their new list.

Priorities were established for the concern statements in each group of twelve by the "spend a dollar" technique. Each member of the group "voted" on each statement by placing any amount (up to one dollar) on the statements that he gave the highest priority. A statement could receive dollar amounts from zero to one dollar. However, as there were eight or nine statements on which to set priorities, generally high priority statements received fifty or sixty cents and statements of low priority received nothing or possibly five cents.

At the conclusion of the exercise the dollar amounts were accumulated for each statement in the group.

At the close of the Task, a member of each group of twelve presented the list of statements and their priority order to the conference. (See Appendix E for the list of concerns in priority order).

Trained facilitators were used in the exercise. The evaluation form was designed to elicit conference reaction to the

group processing more than the specific task. The wording was changed on the form by the conferees just before they completed the statements. It read:

The process of grouping in triads, then six's and then twelves -- forming consensus and prioritizing was designed to elicit conferee input for the topics to be considered for the Topical conferences. (Check all appropriate)

3 I really don't like activities like these.

33 I liked this activity.

34 I feel that my concerns were represented in our final product.

6 We could have accomplished the same results with just a simple listing.

(Cumulative tallys are recorded)

The objective seemed to have been met and the people engaging in the group processing techniques seemed to like the activity and felt their concerns were represented in the final outcome.

The Conference Participants

Seventy-seven people were registered for the conference. This number included the main body of SEA Dissemination Representatives plus presentors from SEAs, CCSSO, NIE, and OE; group facilitators and interested others.

Forty-seven conferees filled out the evaluation instrument -- forty-three were employed by the SEA, two by regional

or intermediate units and the other two were employed by other than SEA, LEA, or IEA units.

Twenty-two of the forty-seven were assigned 100% of their time in dissemination/diffusion activities. The average time span for all the forty-seven in dissemination/diffusion activities was 60.46%.

The statement on age range provided interesting data --

1 less than 25
16 25 - 34
10 35 - 44
14 45 - 54
4 more

Two conferees had no age.

Location and Facilities

Conferees were asked to comment on the location of the meeting and the facility. The three previous National Dissemination Conferences were held in Washington, D. C. and the NDLP Steering Committee wanted some data on their choice to move the conference to a more central location. The following questions on the evaluation instrument referred to location and facilities:

I liked the more central location (Kansas City).

32 yes, 5 no, 9 no comment

I would rather have the conference in Washington, D. C.:

9 yes 30 not necessarily 7 no comment

I would like to have been able to see more NIE staff: (If the conference is in Washington, more NIE staff can be at the conference -- travel restrictions).

15 yes 28 not necessarily 2 no comment

I like being near the airport: (which was 5 minutes away)

25 yes 13 no 8 no comment

The Next Conference

The question was asked, "If you were planning the conference, what would you have done differently?" Some comments follow:

-- fewer large groups, more workshop oriented discussion groups using "expert" moderator;
-- broken up first afternoon activities - sharing with several local presentations;
-- avoid long introduction session;
-- lots more activity and sharing of products;
-- eliminate all jargon;
-- sort out SEA as to level of sophistication;
-- objective 2 (non-expert) was a weak area;
-- group processing at an earlier time;
-- more NIE and USOE staff;
-- more time for regional interaction (provided one evening)

-- very well done;

-- give more exposure to existing, successful dissemination efforts;

-- more show and tell;

-- the last day was largely wasted;

-- less NIE;

-- more concrete examples of working programs;

-- include time for sharing of experiences;

-- nothing - everything was O.K.;

-- more interchange between state reps;

-- build in a little humor;

-- more input on NIE dissemination plans;

-- more dialogue;

-- well done;

-- orientation of new dissemination reps;

-- cut the ritual at the beginning;

-- less lecturing;

-- June is too late in the year.

Observations of the NDLP Project Director:

* Using the NDLP Steering Committee as conference staff seemed to work very nicely;

* Having staff meetings and staff debriefing sessions during the conference proved invaluable in taking the "pulse" on the conference and making changes in agenda when necessary;

* Trained group facilitators are important if true consensus and prioritizing is a conference task;
* It was a successful conference.

APPENDIX A

CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

Alabama	John L. Hayman, Director Alabama Information & Development System Alabama State Education Department State Office Building Montgomery, Alabama
	Clark D. Williams, Coordinator Consolidated and Special Grants State Office Building Montgomery, Alabama
Arizona	Beverly Wheeler, Director Dissemination Project Arizona Department of Education 1535 West Jefferson Phoenix, Arizona 85007
California	George Neill, Ass't Superintendent Information/Dissemination 721 Capitol Hall Sacramento, California 95814
	John A. Emrick, Director Evaluation of NDN SRI Menlo Park, California 94025
Colorado	William M. Davis Colorado State Facilitator 830 South Lincoln Longmont, Colorado
	Diane Wilson Dissemination Consultant Colorado Department of Education 201 East Colfax Denver, Colorado 80203
Connecticut	Harry W. Osgood, Director Educational Services Center 800 Dixavell Avenue New Haven, Connecticut 06511

	Roger E. Richards Dissemination Coordinator Connecticut State Department of Education Hartford, Connecticut
Delaware	Thomas H. Baker, State Specialist Educational Research Dissemination Dept. of Public Instruction Townsend Building Dover, Delaware 19901
	Winston Cleland Supervisor of Research Dissemination Dept. of Public Instruction Townsend Building Dover, Delaware 19901
Florida	Inga G. Fahs, Director Dissemination/Diffusion Florida Department of Education
	Forrest VanCamp Florida Facilitator Center P.A.E.C. P.O. Drawer 190 Chipley, Florida 32428
Georgia	Dr. Anne Houghon State Department of Education Atlanta, Georgia 30334
Hawaii	Ichiro Fukumoto, Director Planning/Evaluation Services Office of Superintendent Honolulu, Hawaii 96804
	Koozo Okamoto, Staff Specialist Department of Education State of Hawaii P.O. Box 2360 Honolulu, Hawaii 95804
Illinois	Carol Reisinger State Dissemination Illinois Office of Education 100 North First Street Springfield, Illinois 62777

Indiana	Jerry R. Powell, Director Division of Information System Sciences State Dept. of Public Instruction 120 West Market Street, 16th Floor Indianapolis, Indiana 46204
Iowa	Mary Jo Bruett, Referral Specialist Iowa Department of Public Instruction Des Moines, Iowa
Kansas	Merle R. Bolton Commissioner of Education Kansas State Department of Education 120 East Tenth Topeka, Kansas 66612 James Connett Educational Programs Facilitator, Project LINK Wichita, Kansas Nancy Flott, Acting Director KEDDS 120 East Tenth Topeka, Kansas 66612 Linda McNeely, Information Coordinator NKEC Colby, Kansas 67701
Kentucky	E. Norman Sims, Coordinator Information Dissemination for Research and Development Department of Education 2007 Capital Plaza Tower Frankfort, Kentucky 40601 Vonda Lynn Wood Director of Dissemination 1701 Capital Plaza Tower Frankfort, Kentucky 40601
Louisiana	Pete Shell, Research Coordinator P.O. Box 20453 Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803

Maine	Richard W. Redmond Assistant to Commissioner State Department of Education Augusta, Maine 04333
Maryland	Leonard Garlick Consultant in Systems & Development Maryland State Department of Education Box 8717 BWI Airport Baltimore, Maryland 21240
Michigan	James P. Bebermeyer Educational Research Consultant State Department of Education P.O. Box 420 Lansing, Michigan 48902 John R. Osborne, Coordinator Dissemination Unit Experimental & Demonstration Centers Michigan Department of Education Box 420 Lansing, Michigan 48902
Minnesota	Helen D. Dell Dissemination Consultant State Department of Education 550 Cedar Street St. Paul, Minnesota 58710 Pat Tupper, Librarian Department of Education 401 Capitol Square Building St. Paul, Minnesota 55101
Mississippi	John O. Ethridge Administrative Assistant State Department of Education Box 771 Jackson, Mississippi 39205
Missouri	Lochran C. Nixon Executive Director Mid-Continent Education Lab 7302 Pennsylvania Avenue Kansas City, Missouri 64114

	Dr. H. LaMarr Rice Administrator, Educator, Consultant 201 Redwing Drive Lee's Summit, Missouri 64063
	Glenn White, Director Research Unit State Department of Education P.O. Box 480 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
Montana	Phyllis Galt Resource Center Supervisor Helena, Montana
	Cheryl S. Hutchinson Director, Project Exchange Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction State Capitol Helena, Montana 59601
Nebraska	Royal Henline Administrator, Curriculum Services State Department of Education 233 South Tenth Street Lincoln, Nebraska 68508
	Joan Orender Project Director Nebraska Department of Education 233 South Tenth Street Lincoln, Nebraska 68508
Nevada	Kay W. Palmer Administrator, EHIS Department of Education 400 West King Street Capitol Complex Carson City, Nevada 89710
New Hampshire	Robert H. Trombly, Project Officer New England Program in Teacher Education Pettee Brook Offices P.O. Box 50 Durham, New Hampshire 03824

	Sherman Wheeler, Consultant N.H. State Department of Education Concord, New Hampshire 03301
New Mexico	George H. Smith, State Facilitator Box 640 Bernalilio, New Mexico
New York	Gregory Benson, Coordinator Educational Programs & Studies Information Services Room 330 State Department of Education Albany, New York 12234
North Carolina	Bob Byrd, State Facilitator Southwest Regional Education Center 619 Wall Street Albemarle, North Carolina 28001
	Larry P. Graham Director, NIE Capacity Building Grant State Department of Public Instruction Division of Development Raleigh, North Carolina
	Doren Madey National Testing Service 2526 Erwin Road Durham, North Carolina 27705
	Jack Stenner, President National Testing Service 2526 Erwin Road Durham, North Carolina 27705
Ohio	C. William Phillips, Coordinator Education Professions Development Department of Education 65 South Front Street Columbus, Ohio 43215
	Franklin S. Scott Consultant, Division of Planning & Eval. Department of Education 65 South Front Street, Room 908 Columbus, Ohio 43215

Oklahoma	James L. Casey Administration Planning Oliver Hodge Memorial Education Bldg. Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73105 Jack Craddock, Director Communications and Information State Department of Education 2500 North Lincoln Oklahoma City, Oklahoma
Oregon	Rob Fussell Dissemination Specialist 942 Lancaster Drive, N.E. Salem, Oregon 97301 George Katagiri, Director Instructional Technology State Department of Education 942 Lancaster Drive, N.E. Salem, Oregon 97310
Pennsylvania	Richard R. Brickley, Director RISE 198 Allendale Road King of Prussia, Pennsylvania 19401 Carolyn Trohoski RISE 198 Allendale Road King of Prussia, Pennsylvania 19401
Puerto Rico	Rosita Cruz Dissemination Program Coordinator Department of Education Hato Rey, Puerto Rico Sylvia E. Rodriguez General Supervisor Department of Education Hato Rey, Puerto Rico
Rhode Island	Edward L. Dambruch, Director R.I. Teacher Center Department of Education Hayes Street Providence, Rhode Island 02908

	Charles Mojkowski 60 Gardner Avenue No. Providence, Rhode Island 02911
South Carolina	Alfonso J. Evans Chief Supervisor 1206-A Rutledge Building Columbus, South Carolina 29201
	Elmer L. Knight, Director Education Products Center State Department of Education 7206 Rutledge Building Columbia, South Carolina 29201
	Jim Linder 130 Center Street Orangeburg, South Carolina 29115
Tennessee	Dee Wilder Information Specialist University of Tennessee -- RCU Knoxville, Tennessee 37916
Texas	Virginia Cutter, Director Dissemination Texas Education Agency Austin, Texas 78701
US Virgin Islands	Henry Nieves Special Assistant to the Commissioner of Education Department of Education St. Thomas, U.S. Virgin Islands 00801
Virginia	Richard B. Chobot Educational Planner American Association of School Administration 1801 North Moore Street Arlington, Virginia 22209
Vermont	Betsy Hoppes Educational Information Specialist State Department of Education Montpelier, Vermont 05673

	John Wincuinas Dissemination Specialist State Department of Education Montpelier, Vermont
Washington, D. C.	Jerry L. Fletcher Senior Policy Analyst H.E.W. 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W. Washington, D. C. 20202
	Charles Haughey NIE
	Richard K. Herlig CCSSO 1201 16th Street, N.W. Washington, D. C. 20036
	Senta Raizen NIE
	Catherine P. Welsh DRG/NIE
Wisconsin	Roy Tally, Supervisor Information Retrieval Center Department of Public Instruction 126 Langdon Street Madison, Wisconsin 53702
Wyoming	Nan Patton Coordinator of Communications Services State Department of Education Hathaway Building Cheyenne, Wyoming 82001

APPENDIX B

NIE SCHOOL PRACTICE AND SERVICE GRANTS

Seven contracts totalling nearly $7 million have been awarded by the NIE to four State Departments of Education and three interstate consortia to support and study ways to increase school use of materials and practices derived from research and development.

Florida Department of Education - Tallahassee, Florida

The Florida Linkage System (FLS) combines Education, University, 5 teacher education centers, 16 school districts, and 22 local schools. It will help the various elements of the State education system to work together to help schools solve reading problems through the use of research and development products.

Georgia Department of Education - Atlanta, Georgia

The State Department of Education, 3 regional Cooperative Educational Service Agencies, and 36 schools will work together to develop a capability to use the results of R&D on basic skills and career education.

Michigan Department of Education - Lansing, Michigan

The Michigan project will work through the Statewide system of Career Education Planning Districts to help local schools in 60 districts plan and implement career education programs.

Pennsylvania Department of Education - Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

This project will link the State department, two intermidate units, and three resource groups (Research and Information Services for Education, Learning R&D Center, and Research for Better Schools) to improve reading and mathematics performance of students in 10 schools.

National Education Association - Washington, D. C.

NEA will work with 60 school districts in 12 States to help teachers choose R&D-based training materials that match their classroom needs and use them in inservice education programs. It will also operate a telephone system to disseminate practical research information in response to specific requests from classroom teachers.

The Network of Innovative Schools - Merrimac, Massachusetts

A consortium of organizations - universities, local school district, non-profit corporations, State-recognized regional service units - will serve as Linking Agents in six

(Massachusetts Cont'd)

States. They will provide technical assistance to school personnel and community leaders in identifying and installing the reading programs that best suit the needs of their students.

Northwest Reading Consortium - Olympia, Washington

Working through regional service agencies, colleges of education, and private R&D organizations, the project will provide technical assistance and other resources to local schools to help them identify and apply R&D solutions to problems in their reading instruction programs.

APPENDIX C

POSSIBLE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE DISSEMINATION ANALYSIS GROUP QUESTIONNAIRE

HOW WOULD YOUR STATE OFFICIALLY REACT TO A RECOMMENDATION THAT:

1. The Federal government should not be involved in implementation assistance at all.

2. States should be enabled and encouraged to establish pools of generalized implementation assistance resources instead of product-related, produce-specific implementation assistance resources.

3. The Federal government should attempt to induce the creation of a single, coordinated nation-wide dissemination system, instead of multiple, competing dissemination systems.

4. Implementation assistance resources from state and Federal sources should be available to help implement programs developed and marketed by private groups and agencies, as well as those marketed and developed by public funds.

5. Federal resources should not support directly the training of users in implementation of new programs, but rather support the training of implementation specialists who would in turn assist users.

6. Federal efforts should attempt to reduce the emphasis on a "transfer of technology" notion of "dissemination and instead encourage other approaches, such as organizational development, local problem solving, and local materials development.

7. Federal efforts should encourage implementation assistance that is characterized by being on-the-user-site, long-term, face-to-face, and provided off-user-site (e.g., at a nearby university), short-term (e.g., a two-week workshop), in a group instruction format, and provided by "experts".

8. Implementation assistance resources should be controlled by LEAs instead of by the agencies providing the assistance.

9. All Federal funds flowing through a state should have a set-aside for dissemination, and the pool of money so provided would be spent by the state for the support of the state's dissemination system.

10. All Federal contracts and grants awarded anywhere in a state should be constrained to be disseminated through the state's, and the nation-wide dissemination system.

11. Some bureaus and agencies at the Federal level should be expected to continue to maintain their own, independent dissemination capability.

12. The Federal government should not attempt to influence the processes users employ to make selections and choices of innovations they want, even if the impact of Federal efforts were to make those processes more rational.

13. Substantial Federal effort should be directed to the problem of increasing the incentives of users to seek outside information and programs.

14. Substantial Federal effort should be directed to the problem of reducing the "information cost thresholds" of seeking outside information and materials.

15. At the Federal level definite priorities for serving different classes of users should be established; individual programs should not be allowed to define their own priorities.

16. All Federal development efforts should be required to provide needed consumer-oriented selection information.

17. A much greater amount of Federal resources in dissemination should go to the support of horizontal exchange of information activities among peers than at present.

18. Before Federal money is spent on one-way spread of information, it should be required that the target audience(s) be clearly specified.

19. Before Federal money is spent on a one-way spread of information, the process of decision-making through which action is to occur based on the information should be identified.

20. Before Federal money is spent on one-way spread of information, there should be evidence that the dissemination effort is designed to achieve specific impact on the decision-makers and the process they use.

21. Federal efforts should be directed toward improving the quality of materials and documents taken into the nation-wide dissemination system, rather than increasing the quantity.

22. Emphasis should be placed on identifying and developing user oriented materials, rather than research reports or theoretical materials.

23. A substantial effort should be made to increase the number of trained dissemination personnel, particularly through creating training programs.

24. States should be encouraged and supported in putting together a state system of dissemination, that is suitable to each particular state, but is compatible with a nation-wide dissemination system.

25. Federal efforts should be directed toward improving the access to resources in the dissemination system.

26. There should be a Federally supported "census" of who in which agency setting is doing what in dissemination.

27. There should be Federal support of experimental inquiry into strategies and tactics of educational dissemination.

28. Federal efforts should be focused on increasing greatly the evaluation of dissemination efforts.

29. At the Federal level there should be created a comprehensive planning and policy setting capacity for dissemination.

30. At the Federal level a communication system for sharing information among the many individuals and units engaged in dissemination should be created.

31. At the Federal level the allocation of resources for dissemination should be made more evan and adequate across the several units responsible for its conduct.

32. The development of regulations and guidelines governing the conduct of dissemination activities at non-federal levels should be coordinated.

33. At the Federal level a mechanism should be established for assessing both formatively and summatively the adequacy of dissemination plans and activities.

APPENDIX D

EVALUATION INSTRUMENT

for the

PROGRAM of the

1976 NATIONAL DISSEMINATION CONFERENCE

Please -- do NOT place your name of this form-
-- do NOT evaluate any session you did not attend.

This information will -

1. give input to the steering committee in planning future conferences

2. be included in the conference procedings document.

NATIONAL DISSEMINATION CONFERENCE
EVALUATION

OBJECTIVE 1 — To bring conferees in contact with leaders of recent national dissemination endeavors

Did the conference accomplish that objective? [ ] yes, [ ] no, [ ] sort of --

Were you able to have any informal sessions with the leaders of the programs?

[ ] yes [ ] no, did not desire too. [ ] no, not enough time.

Please indicate your reaction to and/or possible results of the objective with each activity.

	The Presentation					Probable utilization of information		
	poor		O.K.		very good	subject not relevant to our program	informative would like to use back home	great!! most likely will use back home
Council of Chief State School Officers [CCSSO] dissemination resolution	1	2	3	4	5			
Interstate Project on Dissemination	1	2	3	4	5			
Dissemination Analysis Group	1	2	3	4	5			
National Diffusion Network	1	2	3	4	5			
NIE School Practices and Services Funded Programs	1	2	3	4	5			

Was the objective a worthwhile endeavor for a national conference?

[ ] very much so, [ ] it was O.K., [ ] no!

(1)

OBJECTIVE 2

To allow conferees to interact in voicing dissemination problems, and posing possible solutions

The design was to have new project people ["non-experts"] pose questions to an audience of experienced and inexperienced conferees.

Please check the session(s) you attended. [ ] resources, [ ] linkage, [ ] management

I consider myself -- [ ] experienced in the field of dissemination, [ ] relatively new to the field, [ ] somewhere in between.

(mark those appropriate)

[ ] I gained much from the questions asked.

[ ] I knew the questions to ask--but not the answers.

[ ] The solutions proposed seemed realistic.

[ ] The "non-experts" really seemed sincere in seeking solutions.

[ ] The questions asked had no relationship to what I am doing or plan to do.

[ ] It was a wasted afternoon.

[ ] I would rather sit and listen to an "expert."

Was this objective a worthwhile endeavor for a national conference?
[ ] it was O.K.! [ ] no! [ ] very much so.

OBJECTIVE 3

To elicit from conferees concerns related to dissemination/diffusion efforts

The process of grouping in traids, then six's and then twenty fours-forming consensus and prioritizing was designed to elicit conferee input for the annual review of NIE dissemination plans.

(check all appropriate)

[ ] I really don't like activities like this.

[ ] I like this activity.

[ ] I feel that my concerns were represented in our final product.

[ ] We could have accomplished the same results with just a simple listing.

(2)

The process of using the groups of twenty four -- then brainstorming, casting out, and prioritizing was designed to elicit conferee input for the programs of the three Topical Conferences.

(check all appropriate)

[ ] I really don't like activities like this.

[ ] I like this activity.

[ ] I feel that my concerns were represented in our final product.

[ ] We could have accomplished the same results ranking items on a list.

Was this objective a worthwhile endeavor for a national conference?
[ ] it was O.K., [ ] no! [ ] very much so;

LOCATION AND FACILITIES

You probably would have preferred to have the conference in some exotic place-- However, considering this was a working conference funded by NIE --

I liked the more central location [ ] yes, [ ] no, [ ] no comment.

I like being near the airport. [ ] yes, [ ] no, [ ] no comment.

Hotel accomodations were fine [ ] yes, [ ] no
If no, why?

Having different activities simultaneously in the very large meeting rooms was designed to produce a feeling of much activity.

[ ] I liked that room utilization.

[ ] I prefer the smaller break-out rooms.

[ ] There was too much activity, I was distracted.

I would rather have the conference in Washington, D.C. [ ] yes, [ ] not necessarily, [ ] no comment.

I would liked to have been able to see more NIE staff. [ ] yes, [ ] not necessarily, [ ] no comment.

(3)

To make the conference evaluation more meaningful--we need some information about you

Employed by: ___State Department of Education

___Regional Service Unit (BOCES, etc.)

___Local ducation Agency

___Other

How much of your professional time do you spend in dissemination/diffusion?____%

Assuming that dissemination/diffusion consists of management, resources and linkage components, what percent of your time ,question above) do you spend in --

Management____% Resources____% Linkage____%

Your age range is: [ ] less than 25, [ ] 25-34, [ ] 35-44, [ ] 45-54, [ ] more!

If you were planning the conference, what would you have done differently?

What would you like included in the next National Dissemination Conference?

(4)

APPENDIX E

TOPICAL CONFERENCE PRIORITIES

Group A

1. Working conference to produce a handbook of dissemination concepts and practices designed for staff development that flows logically from IPOD.

2. How do we coordinate into a rational system what appears to be fragmented dissemination activities at the SEA level.

3. Identify training objectives, training models. Development at training packages for various linkage components w/accompanying implementation strategies.

4. Models for resource bases - people, programs, practices, materials.

5. Identification of exemplary dissemination ideas, practices, programs, products and provide opportunity for exchange of these.

Group B

4.35 Management of dissemination concepts/structure Organization of Resources - State Department

2.30 Rescurces - SEA influences - Meet & State Exemp. file - Newsletter groups - Special Ed., Vocational Ed., etc - Human Resources file - Sharing among states what is in it and what is needed.

2.25 Linkage - mechanics - skills, training programs - interpresonal relationship.

1.60 Evaluation of dissemination program, development of program design - development of implementation of evaluation design

Group C

1. IPOD framework
2. Methods for initiating a dissemination program (includes building support, identifying needs)
3. Training in linkage function to include change process models and practical linkage techniques
4. Management techniques and organizational development for the coordination dissemination system
5. State based film development programs, practices, people, materials
6. Clearinghouses, (ERIC) SEA relationships with clearinghouses, procedures, sponsoring agencies

---

Group D

2.65 State of the Art of the Nationwide Disseminaiton System(s)

1.95 Organizational development (models, practices from allied fields)

1.75 Linkage techniques at all levels to include higher education inst., agencies, associations, libraties

1.65 Implementation of IPOD framework at State level - (How to)

1.55 Information packaging, abstracting, retrieval

1.50 Pre-service, in-service, staff development techniques